

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed June 30, 2005 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claims 1-10 and 12-26 were pending in the application. Claims 13-25 have been withdrawn. No claims have been amended, canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 12-26 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is requested for at least the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-10, 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 196 00 348 ("Lewecke") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,922 ("Lisec"). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn at least because the references, taken together or separately, fail to disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention. For example, Lewecke and Lisec do not teach or suggest "wherein steps a and b are repeated such that glass plates are extracted from the storage unit and loading portions are delivered to the glass processing installation in a predetermined sequence," as required by claim 1. In particular, the references do not provide loading portions with scribing lines and store the remainders of the glass plates in a storage unit, which allows the glass processing installation to be fed with a predetermined sequence of scribed loading portions to that a subsequent positioning for a scribing operation is no longer needed. Lewecke merely discloses that the placing into and out of storage is computer controlled. See Lewecke at p. 2, lines 34-36. Lewecke does not deliver a predetermined sequence of glass plates from the storage unit to the glass processing installation.

Lisec actually teaches away from the claimed invention. Lisec discloses notching a glass panel (1), sending the glass panel through several breaking stations (3, 4, 8, and 10) and then, after the glass plate is processed as a whole, the broken parts are sent to a storage unit (12). If glass plates of different types are needed, the separated glass plates have to be sorted and temporarily stored, such as in the storage unit (12). In addition, the production of a small number of glass plates of a given dimension is hampered because the whole glass plate must always be processed. Lisec does not disclose loading a glass plate installation with a

predetermined sequence. Rather, the storage unit (12) is fed with the entirety of the glass plates. Furthermore, Lisec does not teach or suggest a loading portion that is sent to the installation and a remainder portion that is stored. All parts are stored. *See* Lisec at Fig. 2; and col. 2, line 64 to col. 3, line 20. Therefore, there is no predetermined sequence in loading the installation. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10, 12 and 26 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

For example, the references do not teach or suggest “wherein in step a the glass plate is only partially extracted from the storage unit such that for dividing the glass plate the residual portion is supported by the storage unit,” as required by claim 3. Lewecke discloses moving a sheet (P) out of a storage shelving (R) to be cut at a workstation. *See* Lewecke (translation) at p. 5, lines 13-18 and p. 7, lines 16-17. Accordingly, dependent claim 3 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Additionally, the references do not teach or suggest “wherein at least one loading portion, which is to be separated from a glass plate, is completely scribed before performing step b, such that the loading portion, after severing and delivering to the glass processing installation, is adapted to be divided in the desired portions without another scribing operation,” as required by claim 12. It is clear that Lewecke does not disclose as scribing operation whatsoever. While Lisec discloses notching a glass panel (1), conveying the glass panel through three or four breaking station (3, 4, 8, and 10) and then sending the sections of the glass panel into a storing device (12) or double-glazing line, Lisec does not perform the dividing operation “after severing and delivering to the glass processing installation.” Rather Lisec performs the breaking or dividing prior to the sections of the glass panel being delivered to the storage device. *See* Lisec at Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 50-63. Consequently, the cited references do not render claim 12 unpatentable.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 30, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Jessica Palmer Reg. NO. 56,986  
JESSICA PALMER  
George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072